**SCORING RUBRIC FOR SOVIET WAR PLANESSAY**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strong** | **Moderately**  **Strong** | **Average** | **Moderately Weak** | **Weak** |
| Discusses the purpose of the war plan and the importance of the cities examined | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| Provides specific examples from the plan to support your discussions | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| Provides a clear comparison of the three different war plans and supports their opinion on the feasibility of the Cold War plan. | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| Conveys clear meaning by using proper grammar, spelling and punctuation | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| Follows instructions with regard to mechanics of writing the paper | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |

A “**5”** paper presents a well-developed critique of the discussion and demonstrates good control of the elements of effective writing. A typical paper in this category

* clearly identifies important features of the analysis and develops them in a generally thoughtful way.
* develops ideas clearly, organizes them logically, and connects them with appropriate transitions
* sensibly supports the main points of the analysis
* demonstrates control of the language, demonstrating ability to use the conventions of standard written English but may have occasional flaws.

A”**4”** paper presents a competent analysis and demonstrates adequate control of the elements of writing. A typical paper in this category

* identifies and analyzes important features of the analysis
* develops and organizes ideas satisfactorily but may not connect them with transitions
* supports the main points of the analysis
* demonstrates sufficient control of language to convey ideas with reasonable clarity generally follows the conventions of standard written English but may have some flaws.

A “**3”** paper demonstrates some competence in analytical writing skills and in its control of the elements of writing but is plainly flawed. A typical paper in this category exhibits one or more of the following characteristics:

* does not identify or analyze most if the important features of the discussion, although some analysis is present
* devotes most of its time to analyzing irrelevant issues
* is limited in the logical development and organization of ideas
* offers support of little relevance and value for points of the analysis
* does not convey meaning clearly, or contains occasional major errors or frequent minor errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics

A “**2”** paper demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical writing skills. A typical paper in this category exhibits one or more of the following characteristics:

* does not present a critique based on logical analysis, but may instead present the writer's own views on the subject
* does not develop ideas or is disorganized
* provides little, if any, relevant or reasonable support
* has serious and frequent problems in the use of language and in sentence structure, containing numerous errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics that interfere with meaning.

A “**1”** paper demonstrates fundamental deficiencies in analytical writing skills. A typical paper in this category exhibits more than one of the following characteristics:

* provides little evidence of the ability to understand and analyze
* provides little evidence of the ability to develop an organized response
* has severe and persistent errors in language and sentence structure, containing a pervasive pattern or errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics that results in incoherence

**“0”----**Off-topic